

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 21-39 and 44-54 remain pending in this application. Claims 40-43 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 53-54 have been added.

Claim Objections

The claims have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-28 and 30-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubis et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,324) in view of Katzman et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,228,496). Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubis et al in view of Katzman et al, as applied to claim 21, and further in view of Kuchta et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,319). These rejections are traversed as follows.

According to the present invention, a storage system has a plurality of processor adapters, a plurality of first interface adapters, and a plurality of second interface adapters. The number of processor adapters are increased or decreased based on a required performance. As such, system performance can be flexibly changed based upon the demands of a user by adjusting the number of processor

adapters. In addition, the capacity of the processor adapters can be optimally assigned by considering the performance of the storage system as a whole.

On page 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that " Hubis does not expressly disclose a plurality of processor adapters: wherein the number of said processor adapters are increased or decreased based on a required performance". The Examiner relies upon Katzman et al for curing this deficiency. Applicants' respectfully disagree.

In Fig. 1 of Katzman et al, element 33 does not show a processor unit in a storage device, but instead shows processor units in host computers. Element 33 of Katzman et al is included in a host computer, such as that corresponding to server 3 of the present application (see Fig. 3) which is not part of a storage device of the present application (for example, see Fig. 19). Therefore, the processor units of Katzman et al cannot be equated with the processor adapters of the presently claimed invention.

All of the independent claims recite that processor adapters of a storage system can be increased or decreased based on a required performance. Therefore, it is submitted that all of the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art. The cited reference to Kuchta et al is only applied to claim 29 and does not cure the deficiencies mentioned above with respect to the primary references.

Appl. No. 10/820,964
Amendment dated May 2, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2008

H-5028

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By 
Shrinath Malur
Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120